

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed December 12, 2008 the Office noted that claims 8-17 were pending and rejected claims 8-17. No claims have been amended. Thus, in view of the foregoing claims 8-17 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sugikawa, U.S. Patent No. 5,949,772 in view of Amano, U.S. Patent No. 2002/0120647. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Sugikawa discusses that upon the withdrawal of a device from a network a new service providing device is selected among other devices.

Amano discusses the detection of errors in mark-up language data and the output of corrected data.

In contrast, the present invention embodied in the claims is directed to an error correction solution with a self learning capability. If a service request contains an error correction process is initiated. In such a process a memory containing only service request whose contents are corrected are utilized. In the process the received service request with an

error is at least partly substituted with contents of a service request (which most resembles the service request) stored in the memory.

On page 12 of the Office Action, in the *Response to Arguments*, it is asserted that "the specification provides no definition of the term 'correct' so examiner interprets that since the information is in the memory, that it's correct."

However, the present application deals specifically with a solution of correcting service requests that contain an error by substituting content of a service request with an error with the content of a correct service request stored in a memory, as explained on original (WO 2004/030325) page 5 lines 1-19, for instance.

Regarding the "definition" of the term "correct", it seems that page 2 lines 16-25, for instance, give such a definition. Here it is explained that

The error correction capabilities make it possible for the information system to correct service requests including errors such that the subscriber having transmitted a service request with an error will receive the desired service anyway. The solution of the independent claims involves a self-learning error correction capability. This is achieved as service requests which have led to a successful identification of the requested service are stored in a memory. This memory will thus include only those service requests whose contents are correct, as they have al/viously led to successful identification of the requested service. [Emphasis added]

Thus, service requests whose contents are correct are such service requests which lead (have led) to successful identification of a service available in the system. Therefore

the specification does indeed define the term "correct".

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office asserts that Sugikawa, col. 11 lines 31-34 disclose "analyzing said service request at said access point in order to identify a predetermined keyword indicating a service source offering the requested service," and col. 11, 41-65 disclose "forwarding said service request to a service source identified in said analysis," as in claim 8.

However, in Sugikawa it is explained that unit A receives a service request from a user (col. 11 lines 49 - 50), and that this service request is transmitted to all the devices on the network B, C, D and E (col. 12 lines 2-6 and 13-15). No kind of analyzing to identify devices capable of providing the service is carried out, therefore the service request is transmitted also to devices C and E, even though these devices are not able to provide the service (col. 11 lines 46-47). Therefore Sugikawa fails to disclose the above recited features. The Office does not assert and the Applicants have not found that Amano discloses such a feature.

Sugikawa therefore relates to a solution which is fundamentally different as compared to the claimed invention, as a service request is forwarded to all devices of a network. In the claimed invention, however, the service request is analyzed in advance in order to identify a service source offering the requested service, after which the service request is forwarded

to the identified source. In the claimed invention, in order to obtain a solution where also a service request containing a typing error can be forwarded to a correct service source, it is advantageous to utilize the claimed error correction. Such an error correction is, however, not needed or disclosed (as acknowledged in the official action) by Sugikawa, as the service request (with or without a typing error) in any case will be sent to all the other devices on the network.

Amano discusses a solution which is very different than the claimed invention. As shown in Figure 7 and the related description, a first computer 10 is used for generating application data 41 including correction information of a document which is transmitted by a data transmission unit 30 to a second computer 20 (¶¶ 0074 and 0075). In order to be able to generate the original document without errors, the second computer analyses the received application data 41 which includes correction information, and detects or corrects errors in the document (¶ 0076). Such a solution does not involve an access point or a plurality of service sources, and therefore fails to teach or disclose the features of: analyzing a service request at an access point in order to identify a service source offering the requested service, and forwarding the service request to the identified source.

In addition, the error correction carried out by the utilized error correction devices is very different as compared

to the claimed invention. In Amano a tag set is defined to mark out portions of documents that might otherwise be rewritten to include errors. Amano ¶ 0014, for instance explains that a tag set is defined for characters with similar shape or a similar character, for instance. In this way characters with a similar shape (such as minus and hyphen) can be identified as separate characters (¶ 0008).

Therefore the error prevention/detection/correction markup addition module 13 of the first computer 10 of Fig. 7 marks out the relevant portions, and subsequently the error detection/correction module 23 of the second computer 23 corrects the errors.

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office acknowledges that Sugikawa does not disclose "initiating an error correction process to correct the received service request by utilizing service requests stored in said memory containing only service requests whose contents are correct, if said analyzing at said access point or said analyzing at said service source fails for the received service request, as no service source or no service can be identified," but instead asserts that Amano ¶¶ 0001-0020 do.

However, as the solution of Amano does not involve any access point which would analyze a service request as in the claimed invention, or which would initiate error Correction of the service request if the analyzing fails to identify a service

source or service. Instead, Amano discloses that each and every document is automatically subjected to error correction at a receiving computer in order to identify possible tags that should be corrected in the received document.

Further on page 3 of the Office Action, it is asserted that Sugikawa, col. 11, lines 25-37 discloses "storing, in a memory containing only service requests whose contents are correct, said service request if the service request has led to successful identification of the requested service," as in claim 8.

However, Sugikawa always stores any request and does not analyze it prior to storing. Thus, it cannot be said that the contents are correct in Sugikawa. The Office does not assert and the Applicants have not found that Amana discloses such a feature.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Sugikawa and Amana, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 8, 10 and 15 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 8-17 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted

that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston/
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb